

REMARKS

In accordance with the forgoing, no claim amendments are filed herein. Claims 1-11 remain pending and stand finally rejected. No new matter is being presented, and reconsideration of the claims in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-11 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Tagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,947,728) (hereinafter “Tagawa”) in view of Yamedera et al. (U.S. 2002/0123368) (hereinafter “Yamedera”). The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The following is a comparison between embodiments of the present invention and the cited art.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites a non-telephone unit operable to execute the non-telephone function; an auto-power-off unit operable to cause a timer to operate during execution of the non-telephone function, and automatically stop the execution of the non-telephone function when the timer indicates an elapse of a predetermined time period; a telephone unit operable to execute the telephone function; and a reset unit operable to reset the timer to an initial state each time a predetermined operation relating to the telephone function is executed.

Conventionally, a mobile phone may have non-telephone functions including a digital camera function, a music play function, a radio function and/or a TV function. If a user falls asleep or forgets that the mobile is executing one or more of these functions, for example, these functions fail to be stopped, and the battery power may be wastefully consumed. As an exemplary advantage of embodiments of the present invention, an auto-power-off unit causes a timer to operate during execution of a non-telephone function, and automatically stops the execution of the non-telephone function when the timer indicates an elapse of a predetermined time period. A reset unit rests the timer to an initial state each time a predetermined operation relating to the telephone function is executed. Thus, wasteful battery consumption is avoided.

Tagawa states that “in case of stopping reproduction of music on receiving a call, music reproduction is resumed at the position run back for a predetermined time period from that of receiving a call, or from the beginning of the music.” (See column 3, lines 9-23). Tagawa further states, “[a]lso, the mobile phone may further comprise a unit operable to count elapsed time after a

call arrives, in which... consumption can be cut down.” (See column 3, line 63, to column 4, line 2). (The Examiner further refers to column 12, lines 64, to column 13, line 2, column 13, lines 20-51, column 16, lines 10-25, and Figs. 13A-14B).

However, none of the cited portions of Tagawa discloses resetting the timer (that measures execution time of the non-telephone functions) to an initial state each time a predetermined operation relating to the telephone function is executed, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that Tagawa discloses these features by disclosing that, in case of stopping reproduction of music upon receiving a call, music reproduction is resumed at the position run back for a predetermined time period from that of receiving a call, or from the beginning of the music. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s understanding of Tagawa. It is submitted that merely *resuming* music reproduction at the position run back for a predetermined time period from that of receiving a call, or from the beginning of the music, is not equivalent to *resetting the timer* to an initial state each time a predetermined operation relating to the telephone function is executed, as recited in independent claim 1.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Tagawa fails to teach or suggest an auto-power-off unit operable to cause a timer to operate during execution of the non-telephone function, and automatically stop the execution of the non-telephone function when the timer indicates an elapse of a predetermined time period; and a reset unit operable to reset the timer to an initial state each time a predetermined operation relating to the telephone function is executed, as recited in independent claim 1. Independent claim 11 recites features substantially similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Tagawa for at least the foregoing reasons. Yamedera is cited as disclosing an auto power off unit, but makes no mention of resetting the timer to an initial state each time a predetermined operation relating to the telephone function is executed, and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Tagawa discussed above.

Claims 2-3 and 5-10 depend from independent claim 1 and inherit the patentability thereof. Therefore, the pending dependent claims patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons presented herein.

Dependent claim 4 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of Yamedera, and further in view of Yoshinaga (U.S. Patent No. 7,096,045). Claim 4 inherits the patentability of independent claim 1, which patentably distinguishes over Tagawa and Yamedera for the reasons presented above. Further, Applicants submit that Yoshinaga fails to cure the deficiencies of the cited art described herein.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 278542005000. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael P. Stanley/
Michael P. Stanley

Registration No.: 58,523
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
(858) 314-7795